

Senator GORTON and Senator HOLLINGS or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I further ask that following the disposition of the Dole amendment, as amended, if amended, Senator THOMPSON be recognized to offer an amendment to limit the bill to Federal court cases only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. So I say to my colleagues, there will be no votes tonight. But anybody who has a second-degree amendment to the Dole amendment, or anybody who wishes to debate, we will be in session as long as that may take.

I thank my colleagues on both sides for agreeing to this request.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent if I could proceed as in morning business for 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN C. STENNIS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it was my honor, a unique honor and special pleasure to serve in this body as the State colleague of John C. Stennis for 10 years. I deeply appreciated the bond of friendship, respect and trust that developed between us as we worked together to represent the interests of the State of Mississippi, and its citizens, in the U.S. Senate.

He had already established a reputation for intelligent leadership in this body when I arrived here, and I considered it my good fortune to be able to learn first hand from him and from his example. We were never rivals. We talked almost every day. He was always friendly and courteous to me, as he was with every other Senator. Although we were members of different political parties, that did not interfere with or detract from our relationship.

Our State has had its share of demagogues, as all other States have, and I have deplored their excesses and have been embarrassed by them. But in Senator Stennis we saw a man as pure in heart and deed with less inclination to inflame the passions of the voters with exaggerated and flamboyant rhetoric as any we have ever elected to public office, and I admired him for that. He preferred to win a debate or an election on the basis of the well argued evidence, rather than to prey upon the fears or suspicions or prejudices of the audience.

He was the kind of Senator I try to be.

During his more than 41 years of service as a U.S. Senator, he was steady, conscientious and extraordinarily successful in every assignment and undertaking.

From his earliest days to his last days he gave the full measure of energy

and his ability to the service of this body and to his State. He saw that as his duty, and he took that as seriously as anyone who has ever served here.

Others have recalled in their speeches the positions of responsibility he held and the legislation he authored and caused to be adopted. There were many of each, and they are persuasive testimony to his effectiveness as a Senator. I will not try to recount all of them.

What may not be as easily measured is the influence he had in the Senate by the force of his character. He was the epitome of rectitude, of fairness, of decorum. His selection to be the first chairman of the Senate's Select Committee on Standards and Conduct was an illustration of the view that others in the body had of him, and the confidence they had in him to do what was right and just.

That is why he was so admired and appreciated in Mississippi. He got things done that helped our State, and its people, but he was more than an effective Senator. He was totally honest and trustworthy.

Mississippi will forever honor the memory of John C. Stennis.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I thank the presiding officer for his patience.

MEDICARE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the Medicare Program. In the recent days, I have noticed all kinds of people expressing deep concern for Medicare. That is comforting, because there is more than enough reason to be concerned.

Let me get right to the point. The Republican leaders in Congress, and the chairs of both Budget Committees in Congress, want to balance the budget in 7 years. If they keep their word and leave Social Security and defense spending completely alone, that will require cuts totaling \$1.2 trillion.

If they throw in the tax cuts for top income-earners that will require another whopping \$345 billion to finance those cuts. Now here's the key point for anyone concerned about Medicare: as we have seen in papers distributed by the Senate Budget Committee itself, this drive for a balanced budget—and presumably some tax cuts—will require cuts in Medicare to the

tune of \$250 to \$300 billion in 7 years. Medicaid will also have to help out with \$160 to \$190 billion in cuts.

The recent talk about Medicare is not really saying this. It is all about the need to shore up the Medicare trust fund, because it could be insolvent in 7 years. It is all about the idea of restructuring Medicare to save the program. The argument we are hearing is that Medicare has to be drained of \$300 billion to save the program. A curious argument.

Somehow, I think we need to make sure Americans, especially the 37 million senior citizens and disabled citizens who rely on Medicare, aren't being sold a bill of goods.

The fact is that the terms set by the leadership on the other side of the aisle—balance the budget by 2002, leave defense alone, and throw in some tax cuts—may require a raid on Medicare to get the job done.

That is why I am here.

My basic reaction to all this talk is to urge the Republican leaders to simply show us precisely what you mean. I am speaking as someone who cast my vote, several times, for a very precise, very specific plan to reduce the federal deficit by \$600 billion. It included savings in Medicare. The 1993 budget and deficit reduction plan was based on the simple concept of shared responsibility, and spread the burden fairly.

Along with spending cuts to reduce the deficit, it did important things like expand the tax credit for working families to make sure work is a better choice than welfare in this country.

But for all of the fire and brimstone heard this year about the need to balance the budget and now "save" the Medicare Program, we have yet to see a budget resolution, a budget plan, a single detail on just how everyone making the noise intends to achieve these impressive goals.

Of course, the President is reacting by saying essentially "show me." He submitted his budget on time. He offered a health care plan that tied Medicare savings to comprehensive health care reform. He rejected the idea of a constitution amendment on the Republicans' terms, and so of course, he is asking for some specifics.

I cannot conceive of a budget that meets the conditions of the other side of the aisle—stay away from Social Security, do not touch defense, no new revenue, and tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy—without huge cuts in Medicare.

And make no mistake about it, \$250 to \$300 billion of cuts in Medicare will mean higher deductibles and premiums for seniors, lower fees for hospitals and doctors, and a lot worse. If there is such a budget that can side-step Medicare, we are simply saying "show us." We have put our cards on the table for the past 2½ years when it comes to health care, Medicare, and deficit reduction.

While all of this talk and born-again interest in Medicare's solvency gets